



**Winter 2000 Meeting, Las Vegas, Nevada
February 15-17, 2000**

Executive Summary and Action Items

This Executive Summary represents discussions from the 16th Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC/WG) meeting held in Las Vegas, Nevada, February 15-17, 2000. The sessions began with a brief discussion led by the group's DOE co-chairs, Judith A. Holm and James H. Carlson. The two announced this meeting would, for the first time, consist almost exclusively of topic group sessions, with a brief plenary session at the end to discuss the groups' activities and action items. The TEC then adjourned to the topic group sessions and met throughout the afternoon of Tuesday, February 15 and all day on February 16, 2000.

After the topic group sessions were held, the participants reconvened on February 17, 2000 to share their findings and pending action items. Detailed notes were developed from the five topic group sessions: communications, protocols, training/medical training, consolidated grant and tribal issues, as well as a final listing of meeting participants, can be found at the TEC/WG website. Please follow the indicated links beginning at www.ntp.doe.gov.

For specific information regarding TEC/WG issues and future meetings, please contact Ms. Holm at (505) 845-4767 or Mr. Carlson at (202) 586-5321. For logistical issues, please contact Susan Martindale, SAIC, at (301) 353-8319.

Communications Topic Group Summary:

Judith Holm (DOE/NTP) and Martha Crosland (DOE/EM) led the group discussion. The group reviewed its accomplishments since the last meeting, which included developing review procedures for new documents, reviewing new fact sheets and information products, completing a survey and paper on advance notification issues related to local governments, and drafting an emergency public communication procedure and submitting it to the DOE protocol writing group, and other items.

The group discussed the potential for concluding its business and closing down; however, additional areas in which input from the group would be useful were identified. The group will address sunsetting after those activities have been completed. Some new action items include reviewing an upcoming National Safety Council brochure on low-level waste and providing input on a website being developed that describes package engineering and testing. The group will also more closely examine issues related to risk

communication and review successes and failures that have occurred in past shipping campaigns with an eye toward developing a summary of “best practices” or “lessons learned.” The group is also reviewing input gained from past environmental impact statements; identifying “hot button” issues related to transportation; developing a listing of key positive messages which can help officials better inform their constituents; and recommend ways to more clearly communicate transportation risks in environmental documentation.

A complete summary of the group’s discussion can be found on the TEC/WG website; please follow the links at www.ntp.doe.gov.

Communications Topic Group Action Items:

1. Participate in review of upcoming National Safety Council brochure on low-level waste (communications topic group).
2. Provide input to packaging and transportation website now under development by Sandia National Laboratories (Holm, Crosland, Niles, Sattler, Espinosa, Hale; with additional review by Senior Executive Transportation Forum and other federal agencies).
3. “Snapshot” survey of risk communication materials including literature on basic principles and application (Bennett, Sarno/Fernald CAB).
4. Research EISs, questions raised by the public in EISs, how they have been answered, and recommend improvements (Bennett).
5. Review successful and unsuccessful transportation communication programs and determine best practices and lessons learned (Helvey, Eidelman,)
6. Identify “hot button” issues through review of outdated NTP fact sheets (Hale, Portner).
7. Review EISs and make recommendations on ways to explain transportation risk more effectively (Helvey, Power, Niles)
8. Develop positive key messages (Niles, Paull and others TBD).

DOE Transportation Protocols Topic Group Summary:

The group discussion was led by Mona Williams (DOE/NTP). The group reviewed five protocols during its sessions; two for the first time and three for the second time. The deadline for submitting new comments was set at March 10. More protocols are being planned for review before the next meeting of the group; in fact, the group may meet separately between now and the next meeting to review a number of drafts (the group did meet in May).

Some recommendations related to the shipment prenotification protocol included; treat all transuranic waste shipments like WIPP shipments; ensure advance notice is received seven or more days in advance of specified shipments; and explore alternate means of prenotification, such as electronic mail. Commenters stressed the shipment planning information protocol should outline the Prospective Shipments Module (PSM) as the key conduit for disseminating information about planned shipping campaigns. They

suggested the PSM be developed annually with quarterly rolling updates as changes occur. In addition, definitions and thresholds such as what constitutes “high volume” shipments are continuing issues.

Discussion about the routing protocol was extensive. Written comments were due March 10; issues related to low-level waste (LLW) garnered the most attention and discussion. Participants suggested looking to guidance promulgated by DOT on non-radioactive hazardous materials routing. Participants noted a continuing difference of opinion on routing and planning for LLW, mostly based on regional differences.

The emergency notification protocol, according to participants, needed to be revised to acknowledge the role of local communities, and to emphasize when in doubt, DOE should notify potentially involved parties. What constitutes an off-normal event also needs to be clarified, they said. Similarly, the emergency response protocol discussion noted the role of local communities needed to be more clearly defined. Unlike other protocols, this one addresses actions to be undertaken by many entities, not just DOE. Public affairs issues related to emergency response will be handled in the public communication protocol.

Several action items included: determining whether an alternate means of communication for advance notification would be acceptable to NRC; release drafts in .pdf format for consistent review; and determine to what extent tribes use a unified command structure.

A complete summary of the group’s discussion can be found on the TEC/WG website; please follow the links at www.ntp.doe.gov.

DOE Transportation Protocols Topic Group Action Items:

- Comments on the routing, emergency notification and emergency response protocols should be provided to DOE (Mona Williams) by March 10.
- Ms. Williams will explore the potential for holding another face-to-face meeting in the May timeframe.
- Ms. Williams will determine whether the PSM can group campaigns by frequency, numbers, or commodities and will report back to the group.
- Mr. Alcock will coordinate with NRC the issue of using electronic notification of jurisdictions needing advance information and will report back to the topic group.
- Mr. Carlson will obtain language from the RW RFP related to routing and provide it to the topic group.
- Future versions of protocols will be provided in .pdf format to ensure consistency in formatting and numbering.
- DOE will provide the above-specified drafts to the group for initial review in April.
- Mr. Dietz will examine whether tribes use the ICS system and will report back to the topic group.

Training Topic Group Summary:

Sixteen Modular Emergency Response for Radiological Emergency Transportation Training (MERRTT) training modules have been completed. A practical exercise/first revision of a drill-in-a-box concept has been completed. A tabletop exercise following the flow of the MERRTT modules; is being integrated in the TEPP training CD. The group also discussed distribution mechanisms for the TEPP training. TEPP coordinators will continue to be used, as will the state points-of-contact, as the primary mechanisms for implementation. Unresolved issues include awareness of the program among small agencies; how to “piggyback” onto other distribution channels; and obtaining resources for small agencies.

The radioactive materials emergency response guide is still under development, and is about eighty percent complete. The topic group generally supports the concept and is reviewing similar products.

The group discussed medical issues extensively. There was some support for a pre-hospital module; the group is reviewing existing programs for content and an initial assessment supports development. The hospital training is to be assessed, and the coroner/medical examiner procedure reviewed. These will be made available through various channels; no module on those aspects will be developed. EMS procedures are also being added to the planning tools. The group also discussed decontamination procedures, and is assessing needs and reviewing options; procedures might be added to Module 13 or to the radioactive materials emergency response guide. Dr. Roger Linnemann also presented information on the medical training for WIPP. Hospital issues included administration/operations, integration of training into hospital functions, clinical evaluation and treatment, and follow-on training.

A complete summary of the group’s discussion can be found on the TEC/WG website; please follow the links at www.ntp.doe.gov.

Training Topic Group Action Items:

1. Develop module for pre-hospital EMS (explore FEMA/self-study options);
2. Complete assessment of hospital emergency room radiological training (discuss with FEMA their prior assessment and results);
3. Add EMS checklist developed as TEPP tool to Module 16 (pg. 4, item 2);
4. Do needs assessment for module on contamination reduction, then draft recommendation for July meeting;
5. Place medical examiner/coroner procedures on web site;
6. Add resource section to CD and web site with hot link to web;
7. Add case studies to Planning Tool web site;
8. Add URL for Tools web site to brochure: www.em.doe.gov/otem;
9. Put MERRTT brochure on CD;
10. Write Network News article on TEPP;
11. Have DOE HQ discuss marketing strategy planning for MERRTT; and
12. Offer CEUs for course material.

DOE Consolidated Grant Topic Group:

The main objective of the topic group discussion was to identify and clarify key issues concerning the proposed consolidated grant.

Ms. Holm noted the group had been formed in December, and two conference calls had been held prior to the Las Vegas meeting. Generally, the participants agreed on desired outcomes; maximizing public health and safety with limited resources is the top priority. Allowable activities under the proposed grant was another area where participants generally agreed; it was suggested the WIPP program be examined and that approach modified if necessary. Issues remaining to be resolved included the process for allocating funds. Some advocated a modification of the current approach taken by WIPP, which involves individual negotiation with tribes, and with states through regional groups. Others advocated a program that would ensure uniform and consistent funding criteria. Much discussion focused on the appropriateness of using a formula approach for determining allocation of funds.

The issue of state permits and fees was also a topic of debate. Some participants noted fees only cover part of the cost of services provided; others suggested DOE might in effect be charged twice for the same activity. Issues specific to tribes also were discussed at length, and focused on tribal sovereignty and the need for individual consultation. Several participants noted any grant proposal should not jeopardize or conflict with the relationships developed by DOE at the regional office level. Tribes' lack of basic infrastructure and resources is also a continuing problem, and participants advocated completing a needs assessment before funding decisions are made.

Outstanding issues that remain include: the background information and concept needs to be better communicated and understood; the timeframe for addressing issues needs to be defined; and there is a need to reconsider the original schedule for drafting a topic group paper.

A complete summary of the group's discussion can be found on the TEC/WG website; please follow the links at www.ntp.doe.gov.

Consolidated Grant Topic Group Action Items:

In general, participants agreed on the need to maintain the dialogue between DOE and TEC/WG members on issues to be worked through before completion of a white paper for the Senior Executive Transportation Forum. The key question to be answered is whether this is the mechanism to achieve the outcomes DOE and states and tribes want. (This question is also being considered internally by DOE.)

The following actions items and issues for further discussion were noted:

1. All participants will go back to their various constituencies to discuss the issues raised in discussions to date;
2. Judith Holm will obtain answers on questions related to the Price Anderson Act and to the issues raised by the Santa Clara Pueblo;
3. Further discussion will be conducted on issues raised, with a view to reaching some accommodation of concerns; and
4. A numbering system will be introduced for all research and discussions papers related to the grant that are available on the web.

Tribal Topic Group Summary:

The group briefly discussed an issue that had been a recurring one in policy discussions—the protection of tribal rights on ceded lands. Participants agreed to help develop a short description of terms such as ceded lands, treaty lands and aboriginal lands to help frame future discussions.

The group also discussed the DOE Indian Policy currently being updated. The third draft is now under development and will be available within the next several weeks. Key definitions of terms such as “consultation” and “trust responsibility” are intended to help give DOE managers a better understanding of how to implement the policy. During the updating process, a call has arisen for development of protocols on which to base true government-to-government relations. Managers will be held accountable for ensuring the new policy is implemented.

The group also discussed a Tribal/State summit held between The State of New Mexico, all the tribes in New Mexico, DOE, FHWA and the BIA. Five topic areas of discussion were developed into six draft agreements. Since the summit was held, one agreement has been signed; the others are being reviewed by the tribal councils. The issues being addressed include transportation infrastructure planning, economic development, land transfers, cooperative planning efforts and safety.

The group discussed DOT’s tribal policy, which had been internally written as DOT guidance for dealing with tribal nations on a government-to-government basis. The policy is a living document, and external comments will be considered. Participants agreed to help disseminate tribal perspectives by participating on other topic groups, and asked more time be devoted for the group to meet in future.

A complete summary of the group’s discussion can be found on the TEC/WG website; please follow the links at www.ntp.doe.gov.

Tribal Issues Topic Group Action Items:

Responsible Party

Action to be Taken

Judith Holm

Provide written response to Santa Clara Pueblo memo of

Kevin Blackwell	February 15 on tribal concerns. Check with the protocols topic group on emergency response issues related to the tribal concerns set out in the February 15 memo from the Pueblo.
Martha Crosland	Explore the idea of putting Tribal Frequently Asked Questions on the EM Web site (in response to issues raised by Santa Clara Pueblo).
J. R. Wilkinson	Provide the topic group with a short definition of ceded lands.
All	Provide NRC with comments on ANPR on Advanced Notification by March 22, 2000.
Wilda Portner	Copy and distribute DOT “Guidance for Conducting Hazardous Materials Flow Surveys” and “United States Hazardous Materials 1997 Economic Census: Transportation 1997 Commodity Flow Survey” document